DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 456 JC 900 305

AUTHOR Glock, Nancy Clover

TITLE Diversity without Divisiveness: toward Agreement on Fundamental Values for a "One World Curriculum".

PUB DATE 90

NOTE 11p.; Paper prepared for presentation at the Biennial Conference for the International Network for Philosophy and Education (London, England, August 1990).

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS College Curriculum; Community Colleges; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; *Cultural Education; *Cultural Influences; Cultural Traits; *Curriculum Development; Educational Objectives; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

As humanity moves rapidly toward a "one world" society, a new paradigm for curriculum development more fundamental than particular cultural traditions must be found. Such a model may be derived from the requirements for the survival of the human species. The content of the resulting curriculum would be: (1) socially cohesive, providing common reference points to all members of society; (2) culturally inclusive, drawing upon diverse human cultures and recognizing the contributions of all social classes; (3) ethically selective, supporting values necessary to environmental and species survival and human fulfillment; (4) conceptually generative, providing skills and general principles which allow for the synthesis and critical assessment of information; and (5) personally significant, creating options for in-depth study of particular cultures, classes, and conditions. This curriculum would recognize a shared humanity, but also the human tendency toward xenophobia which must yield under modern conditions. Old myths of Western Civilization would be replaced with new "one world" myths, that perpetuate certain values (e.g., civil liberty, pluralism, religious tolerance); promote new values (e.g., nonmilitarism, globalism, and mixed economy); re-introduce others (e.g., cooperation, communalism, and respect for all ages and all labor); call some values into question (e.g., environmental exploitation, materialism, competition, and hierarchical management); and fully reject others (e.g., imposed ignorance, religious intolerance, and racism). Sources for this paradigm include the urgent need for worldwide solutions to common problems; new knowledge in human neurology, biology, and anthropology; and the dissolution of rigid ideologies that constrained social analysis and economic and political discourse. (WJT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319456

Diversity Without Divisiveness: Toward Agreement on Fundamental Values for a "One World Curriculum".

Nancy C. Glock

1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N. C. Glock

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TC 900 305

Paper prepared for presentation at the Biennial Conference for the International Network for Philosophy and Education (London, England, August 1990).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DIVERSITY WITHOUT DIVISIVENESS: TOWARD AGREEMENT ON FUNDAMENTAL VALUES FOR A "ONE WORLD CURRICULUM"

Dr. Nancy Clover Glock
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California, USA

ABSTRACT: *Given that curricular content should be drawn from diverse cultural sources--and critiqued from diverse cultural perspectives--and yet must be selective, ethically defensible, and culturally unifying across nations, what values should determine the core curriculum for the future?*

Curriculum selection, and related questions of educational aims, definition of standards, faculty qualifications, pedagogy, and educational funding and governance, must be debated within a common frame of reference. Reference to cultural traditions, which have provided such a common basis in the past, is no longer adequate since if that is the only point of reference, inevitably one culture is preferred over another. Even where a frame of reference drawn from "Western Civilization", for example, is compensated for by adding materials and images from other societies, the basic structure of meaning and value is set by the dominant culture.

As human society moves very rapidly toward a "one world" society, some basis for selection more fundamental than particular cultural traditions must be found. It is proposed that such a basis may be derived from the requirements for survival of the human species, given assumptions as to the biological (including physical and psychological) needs of the species. Determination of these needs is partly a matter of scientific study, but the choice of what to study and the interpretation of the results is not itself a scientific question but a normative one. The relevant normative context in which species survival becomes the fundamental value is both the rapidly evolving "global" culture, and the uncertainty of survival, given inter-societal competition and environmental damage.

The basis for such values is found in a paradigm shift now occurring which may make possible sufficient consensus on the larger frame of reference that fruitful discourse within that framework may move forward, This paradigm shift is embodied in two contrasting origin myths, the "Taleof Western Society", and the "Taleof One World". Differences between these myths provide a basis for posing a set of values and categorizing them as either "continuing", "emerging", "re-emerging", "debatable", or "rejected" by the new paradigm. It is suggested that discussion as to the completeness of this set of values, the definitions of each, their placement in various categories, and their relationship to various educational questions provides a framework for educational discourse that is (a) culturally inclusive, (b) socially unifying, and (c) essentially coherent.

The expectation is that in setting requirements for a "core curriculum" for a "one world" culture, all cultural traditions can be drawn upon, insofar as their works are illustrative of, or are critiqued from the viewpoint of, the values here proposed. At the same time, it is understood that this set of values, which specifically categorizes some traditional values as "rejected" (e.g. racism and sexism) and others as "debatable"(e.g. resource exploitation) is not equally receptive to all cultural traditions. Beyond the "core curriculum" which might form the basis for educational requirements worldwide would be intensive study of particular cultures as needed to sustain individual and social identities. (Particular traditions not only different from, but antithetical to, the "core values", these traditions would not supplant those in the core curriculum, yet could still be vigorously debated, since the "free exchange of ideas" is itself one of the core values. (It remains the paradox of education in a democracy, *that the only certain damage to democracy is to seek to eliminate potential damage by prohibiting "dangerous" ideas, and that its only protection lies in rigorous adherence to the principle of free speech.)*

Underlying this free exchange, however, an emerging world order needs as its point of coherence an emerging world view--a paradigm that can appeal across diversity and win people over by its power to make sense out of the past and create a vision for the future. It is from within such a viewpoint that curricula can be designed that will enable new generations to participate as full members in a "one world" culture whose basic value is respect for human diversity--and trust in human unity.

DIVERSITY WITHOUT DIVISIVENESS: TOWARD AGREEMENT ON FUNDAMENTAL VALUES FOR A "ONE WORLD CURRICULUM"

The Problem

As our world shrinks and we find ourselves drawn with remarkable rapidity into a world-wide cultural system, often living in countries where culturally diverse groups have been taken over by or have migrated into a country alien to them, we are confronted with curricular questions both difficult and inescapable:

> ***If it is the function of education to pass on a culture, then whose culture shall be passed on?***

Shall it be only the "dominant" culture, where by assimilation of the willing and disenfranchisement of the unwilling--*de jure or defacto*--only one culture, one language, and one history (and sometimes only one race or one religion) are "legitimate"? Or shall the cultures be kept somewhat separate by a class system that puts one culture clearly in charge but grants continuity to the others at lower levels in the social order, allowing participation or upward mobility only to a handful of those willing and able to leave their cultural origins behind? Or shall it be regionally determined, where different groups remain in different territories, locally governed by and schooled in the language and traditions of that area, with a centralized system maintaining order? Or shall there be ongoing civil war, sometimes quiescent, sometimes hot?

These seem to be the options most often employed (genocide or racial exclusion, of course, not being included since they are ways of destroying or eliminating cultural diversity rather than accommodating it). Each costs something in the way of social justice, self-esteem, social unity, or civil liberty; each represents a challenge to democracy and each requires a different answer to the question: What shall we teach?

In contrast to these, I want to point to yet another possibility and explore with you briefly its promise and its problems, as a value base for envisioning a "one world curriculum" capable of supporting a democratic future.

The Personal Context

This question is of more than academic interest to me since I approve new curriculum for the California Community Colleges, a system serving more than 1.2 million students in 107 separate colleges, and expected to increase by a third again as many students in the next fifteen years. In California we pride ourselves upon--and scare ourselves with--the realization that we are not only the eighth largest economy in the world, but will soon be the first state in the USA in which no

single race or ethnic group predominates. Our citizens are of Asian, African, Latin American, European, Pacific Island, and aboriginal descent, a fifth native to some other land.

In the past, we have simply "assimilated" such citizens, the goal of education to "make Americans of them" as quickly as possible--Americans speaking only English and becoming successful by the standards of American life, our notorious "materialism" a culturally neutral base for such commonality of aspiration. In a world become skeptical of such materialism, however, and sensitive to cultural imperialism, assimilation is no longer the unquestioned solution.

The Solution

Assimilation fails students of color, among others, inasmuch as it forces them to choose between *respecting their own roots and participating in the larger society.* The demand implicit in the requirements of the traditional curriculum is for students of color to cut themselves off from their roots, deny the value of the subcultures which nurtured them, and disguise, abandon or do battle with a large part of what they have felt themselves to be. Most students are unwilling to pay this price and thus opt out at the cost of their own power, a loss to our economy and a risk to our democracy. Those who are willing to pay the price, however, and to succeed on these terms, are a different kind of loss, for they thus reinforce the narrow confines of a dominant culture whose failings daily become more apparent.

Our initial effort to move beyond assimilation in California has been to *compensate* for the narrowness of our Eurocentric traditions by adding courses and programs and requirements in ethnic studies and to look toward introducing "ethnic diversity across the curriculum" in all of our courses. Yet this approach overburdens an already heavy curriculum, and leaves the structure of the Eurocentric core essentially untouched.

Towards a One World Curriculum

Some of us are beginning to speak instead of the possibility that we might in a sense set aside the "dominant" culture in which history as written by the victors perpetuates racism and injustice in the most subtle, powerful, and intractable of ways, and create in its place a "core" culture, which can be shared by all with the denigration of none. *This curriculum would be rooted not in the old world, or the new world, or the third world, but in the one world that we now share.* It would be:

1. **Socially cohesive**, providing common reference points to all members of the society

2. **Culturally inclusive**, drawing upon diverse human cultures and affirming the contributions of all social classes without particular regard to who have been the "winners"

3. **Ethically selective**, providing common reference points which, on the whole, support the the values necessary to environmental and species survival and human fulfillment and encouraging dialogue on these matters both by appealing to the traditions of many cultures and by critically assessing all such traditions where they seem to be at odds with the core values of a "one world curriculum"

4. **Conceptually generative**, providing skills and general principles, drawn from the main disciplines, which allow for the synthesis and critical assessment of large quantities of information and its integration into practice, while enabling constant updating of knowledge and skill

5. **Personally significant**, creating options for the in-depth study of particular cultures, classes, and conditions, and treating all of these studies with respect, not mistaking the compulsion to merely elevate some cultural traditions at the expense of others with the necessity to uphold standards and teach critical judgement.

The Issue

The difficulty, of course, lies in making a curriculum that is both culturally inclusive and socially cohesive, without being merely eclectic and relativistic. A curriculum that is to enable human beings to survive and to triumph in one world where the control of information and economies are concentrated in ever fewer hands, must be rigorous, demanding competence, and independence of judgment, must offer a strong foundation for appreciation and action. Not all cultures, or all that is important in each can be included, not only for lack of time and expertise, but also because elements of different cultures may be in contradiction at such a deep level as to be unable to coexist within the same educational system without one being accepted as "true" and the other as at most"interesting". Of course, curriculum design is always a matter of selection and of emphasis, but when an educational system can no longer simply rely upon the priorities built into a single cultural tradition--but can pick and choose from the entire world--what is to be the basis of that selection?

The Proposal: A New Paradigm

The basis of curriculum selection and integration that I want us to consider is one of *species survival*, with two primary considerations: (1) recognition of a shared humanity, with a *common biology*, now in immediate danger because we have neglected the ecological and psychological requirements of that biology; and (2) recognition that the xenophobia which preserves particular gene pools and particular cultures by sacrificing individual members of the species in intergroup competition is a human tendency which under modern conditions must give way. And it must give way to the even more fundamental human tendency to ensure group survival by intra-group cooperation, the latter to be accomplished perhaps worldwide by enlarging the cultural core, and hence the "group" to be preserved, to one of universality.

The proposal, then, is to substitute for appeals to *cultural tradition* as the basis for curriculum selection appeals to what is imperative for *species survival.* Presumably, philosophers, curriculum instructors, government policy makers, faculty, communities, parents and students will no more readily agree upon what should be included, given such a criterion, than they now agree upon such selections based on considerations of culture. But the context of the on-going dialogue will have changed and the basis for seeking resolution will have shifted from one which is *inherently alienating* to some, i.e. "whose" culture is to be preserved, to one which is *inherently inclusive*, i.e. "which" values increase the likelihood of the survival of *all* human beings. Under this new paradigm, an appeal to human nature would be our most fundamental argument in seeking to assess pedagogies, curricula, texts, educational governance structures, sequences and settings for instruction, and all else that is relevant to the intentional transmission of culture that we call 'education'.

This appeal to "survival" and to human nature is not to "mere" survival, nor a proposal to substitute in place of ethical discourse, a simplistic appeal to what is "natural". It assumes that survival for human beings is a complex matter requiring human fulfillment and self esteem, because unfulfilled human beings become too dangerous. It assumes that our ethics are not fundamentally at odds with our biology, mutual care and cooperation having been a critical *biological* adaptation insuring the survival of a species whose young remain dependent for many years. It assumes that our concern to act ethically (i.e. to treat similarly those regarded as in the same "category") is a function of our capacity to categorize at all, i.e. of our capacity for language. It assumes that it is language, as well as ritual, music and culture generally, that are uniquely essential to human survival, enabling a cohesion and mutual support so effective as to allowed a relatively slow and weak species to prosper in the natural world beyond all others. From this perspective, human "instincts" are viewed not as the enemy to human cooperation but as its foundation, not "animal" but distinctly human. And cutthroat "competition" is regarded not as "natural" but as a later, primarily cultural adaptation under conditions of population stress to the biological tendency of groups to protect particular gene pools and cultures by destroying outsiders. The sources for this new paradigm, are many:

(i) urgency regarding the need for worldwide solutions to our common problems

(ii) new knowledge in human neurology and biology, ecology, archeology and anthropology

(iii) fresh interpretations of new and old information informed by feminist, tribal, Asian, neo-Marxist and "new age" perspectives

(iv) dissolution of the ideological rigidities that have until very recently constrained social analysis and economic and political discourse (and the unforgettable image of the earth seen from space)

(v) world financial and multi-national corporate transactions with increasing economic interdependence, mirrored by increasing cultural interdependence from foreign schooling, travel, conferences, videotapes, movies, satellite broadcasting and--let's admit it--rock and roll, reggae, and ragas, interacting as *the* music played universally by almost any young adults anywhere able to get their hands on a tape deck

We need--and want--to trust each other and so we turn to a paradigm that justifies such trust. Thus, we find ourselves in the midst of a paradigm shift [1] which, in effect, substitutes a new origin myth for the older "Tale of Western Civilization", a tale which now seems almost bankrupt and more the cause of our problems than the source of a solution. Beyond critique, there must be vision, and that vision must be grounded. The emerging origin myth provides that grounding, allowing us to make a kind of sense out of the past that points to where hope lies in the future, thus enabling action in the present.

Normative Context: Two Myths

Old Myth

The myth I grew up with I will call "The Tale of Western Civilization". It is told to young and old alike on many evenings around the glow of the television screen, inscribed in textbooks, and scrupulously retold by earnest young people on examination papers. It begins with ignorant men of rough demeanor who climbed down out of the trees to roam the earth. Over many eons these men gradually learned to make fires, chip stones into tools, kill animals with the chipped stones, and talk to each other in order to chip better stones and kill bigger animals.

Then one day a very smart man noticed that seeds grow and decided to experiment by planting a seed himself. From this seed sprouted settled villages and eventually settled cities with thick walls and clay tablets for writing and copper bowls and gold jewels and systems of astrology and theology. Now able at last to reason, and with law and military discipline, advanced men went out from these cities to conquer other men too primitive to have discovered planting. Thus were spread the blessings of civilization. These cities sprouted in several places, but the best were the cities of Greece where a few superior men began at last to beat down their passions and ignorant superstitions with reasoned discourse. Alas, because its people forgot to reason this wonderful land fell under the "dark ages", a time when people were either hungry and servile, or noble and true.

After a long time, this wonderful civilization of the past was rediscovered, the lamp of reason was relit, and in time brought forth democracy, refrigeration, modern medicine and Coca Cola. In recent years, all the world has been brought these benefits, thanks to modern science, to the exploitation of natural resources, and to the hard work of good students who earn A's and good employees who come to work every day, having been taught as young children to ignore their immediate impulses in favor of later success.

Now, however, plagues have come upon these people because they have fallen away from the ways that first made them great. Because they have forgotten to postpone pleasure they suffer from overweight, venereal diseases, and drug addiction--and are killing the earth in their pursuit of immediate wealth. Americans are basically nice people who have become confused because everything has changed so fast what with computers and birth control pills. If they can learn to reason better, once again curb their impulses, become less materialistic, restore their family structure, work hard, and learn a little more about good management, they will not only beat the drug problem but also beat the Japanese, regain their economic dominance and reestablish their moral leadership in the world. And if they are Californians, they will be able to do all this from their own ranch style homes, with the sun shining overhead--no matter what color they are--but only if the schools of California can get together and do a better job.

New Myth

The myth our generation may come to tell instead I will call "The Tale of One World". This new tale begins with gentle people brought to harmony with what was around them by a million years of evolution, who knew what to eat and where to find it and did it so well that they worked only a few hours a day and spent the rest of their time in singing and dancing and telling stories to their bright eyed children, having found in words and a bond beyond all others, making of each new child a true member of their particular tribe, and binding it to all the ancestors who ever lived before.

Over many eons these happy creatures were so successful the first population crisis occurred, driving humans out of the Garden of Eden, some to the most inhospitable corners of the earth, others to take up the hard labor of tilling the soil. As agriculture forced these people to stay put and still more were born, cities arose in many places--not because humans were at last ready to discard more "primitive" ways but because hungry people with hungry children burst out of their own territories and conquered others, making slaves of them, and herding all behind thick walls to protect what was theirs--including "their" women. This way of life spread quickly, its only alternatives genocide, escape, subjugation, or emulation.

Under the protection--and oppression--of those most successful in violence, living only with harsh work and dull horizons, these once gentle people were twisted up like corkscrews, making enemies of their own natures and beating upon their own wives and children, struggling to destroy the last, dangerous shreds of an unruly will to joy. Grown in anger, they became remarkable soldiers, ready to be aimed and fired at whatever target those who held them might choose.

Over time, still hungry for a time long forgotten, these people were driven to ever more demanding addictions--coming to love hard work for its own sake, and bigness for the sake of bigness, and doing things just to prove they could be done, and making money just for the things money could buy. They taught their children from birth to sleep in solitary confinement away from all human contact, to accept a plastic nipple and a cloth bear in place of mother's breast and warm arms. They became so good at doing without, that at last they left their homes and mates and children, learning to need nothing but an office and a paycheck and a tape deck and a video with a love scene and a little medication to ease the pain. And their children had nowhere at all to go and no one at all to make them laugh.

In their desperation to feed their addictions, these poor human beings spread the addiction to others, calling it "progress", and rushed over the land, fearful that any single part of it, any remote corner might go to "waste", or that any single moment, or opportunity, or talent, might be "wasted".

Then one day, there were so many of these people that they suddenly stopped, for there was no where else to run--all the new places had been used up. They looked at each other for the first time; old memories returned and they wondered if perhaps they were brothers after all, separated from birth but found at last. Connected with instantaneous messages that flew around the world as quickly as a neighbor's gossip, they began to wonder if they could once again live together as they had before. They called to each other across the spaces through the long, dark nights and once again the words began to work their magic, bonding people to each other and to the ancient ones. Rocking to each others rhythms, singing songs of new awakenings, dancing our their new found love, listening to each others tales, they found they had so many, many stories that they hardly knew which to tell each other first. And so they asked, "Which of our stories must we be sure to tell all the children, all our bright eyed children who are looking up and wondering?"

Normative Context: Values

In the new myth lies a normative direction. If human beings are trustworthy and their bloodthirstiness and elitism a function of social values distorted by ancient necessity, then a new necessity can, with equal power, force a new adaptation. This new adaptation is partly in our hands, a matter of the choices we see as possible. One such possiblity is to envision a "one world" culture which varies richly in its particulars but coheres at its core. Not a core made out of "Western" culture patched up with pieces torn from other traditions, but a whole new cloth, woven from threads of many colors--woven from the love of stories and rythmn, which is human; from the affinity to the land and delight in children which is tribal; from the rooted calmness which is of ancient civilizations; from the mutual support which is of the village--AND from the "rationality" and individuality and love of the intellect which is urban, and that respect for brute fact which is modern. It could be woven from:

"Continuing Values"
Values which (a) have been central to industrialism and which (b) are increasingly viewed as critical to human survival under modern conditions

Civil Liberty	Economic Justice	Rationality
Pluralism	Civil Rights	Free Exchange of Ideas
Religious Tolerance		

"Emerging Values"
Values which (a) have little cultural precedent, having been basic to few if any societies and (b) which have appearedonly as divergent views or pious hopes in the past, but which (c) under modern conditions seem to be emerging as critical

Nonmilitarism	"Globalism"	Mixed Economy

"Re-emerging Values"
Values with (a) long histories that have been basic in many societies right up to and through the present, although(b) rejected or minimized under industrialism, which (c) under modern conditions seem to be again emerging as critical

Cooperation	Decentralization	Environmentalism
Communalism	Self-directed labor/	Appropriate Technology
Respect for All Ages	Participatory "management"	Nurturance
Respect for "Natural Instincts"	Respect for All Labor	

"Debatable Values"
Values which (a) have been central to industrialism but which are now (b) undergoing transformation or are the focus of widespread debate as (c) incongruent with what seems to be critical to human survival under modern conditions.

Environmental Exploitation	Hierarchical Management	Nationalism
Materialism	Coerced Labor	Militarism
Competition	Elitism	Political/Economic Colonialism
Centralization/"Economies of Scale"	Technocracy/Scientism	Information Control

"Rejected Values"
Values with (a) long histories that have been basic in many societies right up to and through the present, but which (b) have been firmly rejected as positive values in industrial society and which (c) continue to be rejected as incongruent with what seems to be critical to human survival under modern conditions.

Imposed Ignorance	Gender Oppression	Racism
Religious Intolerance	Child Abuse	

Notes on the Use of the Normative Model

(a) While it seems the height of arrogance to propose to reassemble from parts of many human cultures a new one more capable of housing the entire family of humankind, it is not clear that there is any other viable choice. It is hard to justify value choices, of course, or to find concurrence for them, or to make political application of them, or live up to them--yet implicit in the enterprise of education is precisely such arrogance. The necessity for each generation to choose what it will pass on to the next is inescapably human: if we approach it gently, seeking discourse and open to emerging possibilities, the many forces rushing toward convergence may bring changes deeper, more rapid, and more healing than we would have thought possible. (Moreover, the fact that this emerging culture threatens to deepen class oppression even more, spreading class alliances around the globe--a "westernization" of the world, is all the more reason to demand that the core culture to be provided through education be truly powerful, and made accessible for all. There is no going back to a time when universal mass media did not exist; there is only going forward with the determination to empower the user.)

(b) The model consists primarily of the categories and is intended to provide a frame of reference for discussing the following questions:

(i) definition of the values listed
(ii) their placement in particular categories
(iii) definition and placement of other values not listed
(iv) the nature of conflicts--and the setting of priorities--between the values listed
(v) the relationship of these values to the selection of content for instruction, the setting of content and skill requirements, the methods of instruction, and the governance and funding of education

(c). The use of these categories as a basis for discussing the selection of content should not be taken to suppose that only content supportive of these values should be included (since, among other things, that would rule out the "classics" of every civilized society) but rather that works be routinely critiqued partly on the basis of such values, as part of the education of students about them.

(d) Presumably, those values categorized as "debatable" will continue to trigger the most lively discourse as to what should be taught with respect to them. To the extent that there is agreement on the underlying paradigm, regarding the primacy of human survival and the relevance to of continuing research into the social and psychological as well as the physical conditions of that survival, such debate need not avoided as threatening to the social order.

(e) Selection of content partly by conscious reference to the values thus to be promulgated is in itself not indoctrinatory since selection--whether engaged in consciously or not-- *is an inescapable part of any system of education or acculturation.* Such selection of content *becomes indoctrinatory when it is used not to identify what should or must be taught , or what may be taught at public expense, but only when it is used to prohibit any advocacy of such views or any discussion of them.* (Indoctrination here means a prohibition on the exchange of ideas or information in the attempt to force belief. Because indoctrination is thus at odds with the values here being advocated it cannot be used even in the service of other values on this list.)

Clearly, there are fundamental conflicts between the values in the last category (i.e. the "rejected") and those in other categories. To the extent that such values are essential to a tradition (as they are in some measure to most "fundamentalist' versions of current religions and cultures as well as to admittedly racist regimes or facist political parties), that would, on this account, *define* that tradition is directly at odds with what has here been viewed as an "emerging world culture". As such, these traditions would be ruled out of even a "multicultural" educational system as too fundamentally at odds with the core values, although still permissible topics for open discussion.)

---

[1]See for example, Andrew Bard Schmookler in *The Parable of the Tribes: The Problem of Power in Social Evolution.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984; paperback, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1986; or Jean Liedloff, *The Continuum Concept*; or S.Boyd Eaton, Marjorie Shostak, & Melvin Konner, *Paleolithic Prescription*; Dahlberg, F. ed. *Woman the Gatherer.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981; Cohen, M.N. *The Food Crisis in Preshistory: Overpopulation and Origins of Agriculture*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES JUL 05 1990